REMARKS

Prior to entry of this Amendment, claims 1-25 are pending in the Application. Herein, claims 1, 3, and 13 are amended, and claims 21-25 have been cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-20 will remain pending in the Application. Entry of this Amendment and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1 and 13 for reciting "identifying whether changes identified in the reconfiguration message are logically consistent", stating that the Specification at page 17, lines 24 supports identifying whether the changes are "logically inconsistent". In response, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 13 to recite the phrase "logically inconsistent".

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

In paragraphs 3-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, stating that it was not clear what logically consistent or inconsistent means. Applicant respectfully traverses, believing the meaning of the claims is clear, especially when viewed in the context of the supporting portions of the Specification. Nevertheless, as noted above, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 13 so that they now recite the phrase "logically inconsistent". In addition, claims 1 and 13 have been amended to clarify that what is being determined is whether the changes identified in the reconfiguration message are logically inconsistent with the current desktop settings. This is also supported in paragraph [0056] of the present Application, where two examples are given:

> This may occur, for example, where certain changes are not enabled by request from a mobile device, and the reconfiguration message contains both enabled and un-enabled changes.

> In another scenario, the reconfiguration request may not `match up` with the current configuration in some way. The requested changes may attempt to change the settings to those already in place, which may or may not have been the intent of the mobile user.

In light of these amendments and supporting examples, Applicant believes that the meaning of this limitation has been clarified, and that this ground for Rejection has been overcome. In addition, it should be apparent that this limitation does not refer determining whether something is "error free". The term "error-free", in fact, is somewhat ambiguous in this context, and does not appear at all in the present Application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraphs 6-21 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9, 11, and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bucknell in view of Kaplan et al. (U.S. Pat. No.7,043,263). Applicant respectfully traverses. As mentioned above, Applicant believes that it is not supported to equate the limitation of identifying whether the changes identified in the reconfiguration message are logically consistent (or inconsistent) with "error-free", that is, checking for software or internal errors in a software installation. In addition, the claims 1 and 13 have been clarified to explicitly recite that the changes identified in the reconfiguration message are compared to the current desktop settings to identify logical inconsistencies. As mentioned above, this amendment is consistent with paragraph [0056], where it is also explained by example. It is not entirely clear what Bucknell is referring to when it mentions "checking that the software is error free" or "testing for internal errors" (Bucknell, paragraph [0029] at lines 7-8 and 18-19), but it is clear that it is not teaching determining whether changes identified in a reconfiguration message are logically inconsistent with current desktop settings.

In addition, it should also be pointed out that Bucknell fails to teach or suggest a reconfiguration message generator for generating a reconfiguration message to reconfigure a desktop manager, a feature which has also been clarified in this Amendment. Bucknell, in contrast, is directed to the reconfiguration communication software so that two terminals wanting to communicate with each other are compatible (Bucknell, paragraph [0001]).

Finally, it is also noted that Kaplan relates to the updating of "feature codes" (examples such as "wireless voice and data exchange protocol parameters" are recited in col. 4, lines 29-44), what appear to refer generally to the capabilities of the mobile phone. Kaplan is not directed to reconfiguring a desktop manager, nor does it therefore teach or suggest generating status summary requests for transmitting to the home node in order to determine the current configuration of a home node desktop manager (of which there is no mention in Kaplan). Kaplan, rather, is directed to resetting the feature codes of a mobile station in a manner that is transparent to the mobile user. As part of this process, the configuration of (that is, features codes used by) the mobile station may be ascertained. (Kaplan, col. 5, line 62 – col. 6, line 16.)

In light of these remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully suggests that the present invention, as recited in amended claims 1 and 13, is distinguishable from the cited references, either alone or taken in combination.

Claims 2-7, 9, 11, and 14-17 depend directly or indirectly from a respective one of claims 1 and 13, and are therefore also distinguishable from the cited prior art at least by virtue of their dependency.

Applicant believes for the above reasons that this ground for rejection has been overcome.

In paragraphs 22-25 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8, 10, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bucknell in view of Kaplan as applied to claims 1, 9, 13, and 17 and further in view of Friend et al. (U.S. Pat. No.

7,243,163). In response Applicant states that the dependent claims 8, 10, and 18 depend directly or indirectly from a respective one of claims 1 or 13 and are distinguishable from the prior art for the reason described above, at least by virtue of their dependency.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully suggests that this ground for rejection has also been overcome.

In paragraphs 26-29 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bucknell in view of Kaplan as applied to claims 1, 9, 13, and 17 and further in view of in view of Zirnstein, Jr. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,127,491 B2). In response, Applicant states that the dependent claims 12, 19, and 20 depend directly or indirectly from a respective one of claims 1 or 13and are distinguishable from the prior art at least by virtue of their dependency.

In addition, without traversing or acquiescing in the Examiner's characterization or combination, Applicant notes that Zirnstein is cited in the Office Action only for use of a Web site. It does not, moreover, teach or suggest the features of the amended independent claims missing from Bucknell as described above. (*See, for example,* Zirnstein at Fig. 6 and col. 9, line 17 – col. 10, line 33; *also* col. 2, lines 23-38, 53-64; and col. 3, lines 30-40.)

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully suggests that this ground for rejection has also been overcome.

In paragraphs 30-34, the Examiner rejected claims 21-22 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) (note – presumably 103) as being unpatentable over Bucknell in view of Friend. In paragraphs 35-36, the Examiner rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bucknell in view of Friend and further in view of Zirnstein et al. In response, Applicant has cancelled claims 21-25 without prejudice.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, the claims 1-20 are believed to now be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment, and examination and allowance of then-pending claims 1-2o is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

Robert H. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,922

KELLY & KRAUSE, L.P.
6600 LBJ Freeway, Suite 275
Dallas, Texas 75240
Telephone: (214) 446-6684
Fax: (214) 446-6692
robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com